



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/595,528	02/28/2007	John Mak	100325.0235US	2288
24392 7590 08/04/2010 FISH & ASSOCIATES, PC ROBERT D. FISH 2603 Main Street Suite 1000 Irvine, CA 92614-6232				
EXAMINER BALDRIDGE, LUKAS M				
ART UNIT 3744		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 08/04/2010		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

rfish@fishiplaw.com
patents@fishiplaw.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/595,528

Applicant(s)

MAK, JOHN

Examiner

LUKAS BALDRIDGE

Art Unit

3744

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/22)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 07/25/2006
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 1-10 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 1 recites the limitation "the distillation column" in lines 10-11. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is suggested that the phrase "the distillation column" be changed to --a distillation column--.
2. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claims 1-5 and 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yao et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,116,050) in view of Jain et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,453,698), and further in view of Campbell et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,771,712).

Regarding claim 1, Yao discloses methods for separating and recovering propane and hydrocarbons from a gas feed. In FIG. 2, Yao discloses an absorber (a demethanizer 20 for separation) configured to separately receive a first and second portion of a feed gas vapor (29, 33), a first and second portion of a feed gas liquid (19, 66) and a first portion of a distillation column overhead (45).

wherein the first portion of the feed gas vapor (29) and the first portion of the distillation column overhead (45) provide reflux to the absorber (col. 8 Ins. 12-26 and col. 10, Ins. 29-31);

a control unit (28a) that controls a ratio of at least one of the first and second portion of the feed gas vapor, the first and second portion of the feed gas liquid, and the first and second portion of the distillation column overhead (col. 8, Ins. 24-27, controlling the flow through line 26 would necessarily control the flow through line 30 and control their ratio).

Yao does not explicitly disclose the absorber receiving a second portion of a distillation column overhead.

Campbell discloses hydrocarbon gas processing in FIGS. 1 and 2 illustrating a first and second portion of a distillation column overhead. For example, FIG. 2 shows overhead vapor stream 36 separated into vapor stream 38 and condensed liquid stream

39 that eventually become combined stream 42 supplied to the absorber 15. Thus, the absorber receives a first and second portion of a distillation column overhead.

Campbell does not disclose the absorber *separately* receiving the first and second portion of a distillation column overhead. However, as seen in FIG. 1, the vapor stream 38 and condensed liquid stream 39 may be separately routed to a desired location. Thus, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention that the streams 38, 39 of FIG. 2 could be independently routed to the absorber 15 because the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Yao to substitute the overhead stream 84 by "a first and a second portion of a distillation column overhead" as taught by Campbell in order to increase the rate of condensation in the absorber column of Yao.

Yao also does not explicitly disclose controlling a ratio of at least one of the first and second portion of the feed gas vapor, the first and second portion of the feed gas liquid, and the first and second portion of the distillation column overhead as a function of a desired recovery rate of a feed gas component in a bottom product of the distillation column.

The general concept of controlling a ratio of at least one of the first and second portion of the feed gas vapor as a function of a desired recovery rate of a feed gas

component in a bottom product of the distillation column falls within the realm of common knowledge as obvious mechanical expedient and is illustrated by Jain. Jain teaches adjusting the first and second portion of the feed gas vapor (26, 24) in FIGS. 2 and 3 to obtain a desired recovery rate. FIG. 2 illustrates a process scheme for high ethane recovery with stream 26 forming 24% (stream 24 forming 76%) of the flow (col. 10, Ins. 31-35), while FIG. 3 shows a scheme for high propane recovery with ethane rejection with stream 26 forming 16% (stream 24 forming 84%) of the flow (col. 12 In. 67 to col. 13 In. 1). Thus, the ratio of the flows are adjusted differently for the type of process scheme and each process scheme has a desired recovery rate of a feed gas component in a bottom product of the distillation column (col. 6 Ins. 1-4 and col. 12 Ins. 45-50). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to provide adjusting the flow ratios of first and second portions of feed gas vapor in order to produce a desired product.

In regard to claim 2, and as applied to claim 1 above, Yao discloses wherein the distillation column (73) is configured to operate as at least one of a demethanizer and a deethanizer (col. 9, In. 40).

Yao fails to explicitly disclose and wherein the feed gas component in the bottom product is ethane.

The general concept of obtaining a feed gas component in the bottom product being ethane falls within the realm of common knowledge as obvious mechanical expedient and is illustrated by Jain. Jain discloses a flexible reflux process for NGL recovery in FIGS. 2 and 3. The plant can be operated in an ethane recovery mode and

an ethane rejection mode (demethanizer and deethanizer, col. 6, Ins. 2-12). In the mode illustrated in FIG. 2, distillation column 84 is operated as a demethanizer to produce ethane as the bottom liquid product 110 (col. 12, Ins. 20-22). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to provide a distillation column operable as a demethanizer and deethanizer, as taught in Jain, in order to increase the recovery and production capabilities of ethane in Yao.

In regard to claim 3, and as applied to claim 1, Yao fails to explicitly disclose wherein the ratio determines absorber overhead temperature.

The modification of Yao in view of the teachings of Jain, as discussed above, teaches wherein the ratio determines absorber overhead temperature. Jain teaches varying a ratio of a first and second portion of feed gas vapor depending on a 2 mode operating scheme (see also col. 6, Ins. 2-4). The specific ratios of streams 24, 26 in each of the modes illustrated in FIGS. 2 and 3 determine absorber overhead temperature (col. 11, Ins. 35-39, "stream 40 is obtained at -143°F" and col. 13, Ins. 40-45, "stream 40 is obtained at -88°F").

In regard to claim 4, and as applied to claim 1, Yao fails to disclose wherein the absorber is configured to operate at an absorber pressure, wherein the distillation column is configured to operate at a distillation column pressure, and wherein the absorber pressure is greater than the distillation column pressure.

The general concept of changing the pressure of components in an NGL process to obtain a desired operation falls within the realm of common knowledge as obvious mechanical expedient and is illustrated by Jain, which teaches the concept of operating

an absorber at an absorber pressure (col. 8, Ins. 8-9) and a distillation column at a distillation column pressure (col. 9, In. 24), where the absorber pressure (350 Psia) is greater than the distillation column pressure (330 Psia). One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to vary the absorber and distillation column pressures in order to obtain the desired plant operation and product.

In regard to claim 5, and as applied to claims 1 and 4, Yao fails to explicitly disclose wherein an absorber bottom product is expanded to provide at least a portion of feed gas chilling.

The general concept of lowering the temperature of a fluid by expanding it to provide cooling to other fluids falls within the realm of common knowledge as obvious mechanical expedient and is illustrated in Yao, which teaches vapor flowing through line 30 (from line 13 at a temperature of about 15°F, see col. 7, Ins. 62-63) and through expander 31 is cooled to -55°F (col. 8, Ins. 27-31). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include the use of an expander in the bottom product 58 of the absorber 20 in order to provide additional feed gas chilling in heat exchanger 12 if desired.

In regard to claim 7, and as applied to claim 1, Yao fails to explicitly disclose wherein the control unit controls a ratio of at least two of the first and second portion of the feed gas vapor, the first and second portion of the feed gas liquid, and the first and second portion of the distillation column overhead. As discussed above, Yao discloses a control unit (28a) that controls a fluid ratio (col. 8, Ins. 24-27, controlling the flow through line 26 would necessarily alter the flow through line 30 and control their ratio).

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to control a second fluid ratio in order to produce a desired flow ratio as similarly produced by the control unit (28a).

In regard to claim 8, and as applied to claim 1, Yao fails to explicitly disclose wherein the control unit controls a ratio of the first and second portion of the feed gas vapor, the first and second portion of the feed gas liquid, and the first and second portion of the distillation column overhead. As discussed above, Yao discloses a control unit (28a) that controls a fluid ratio (col. 8, lns. 24-27, controlling the flow through line 26 would necessarily alter the flow through line 30 and control their ratio). It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to control a ratio of the first and second portion of the feed gas vapor, the first and second portion of the feed gas liquid, and the first and second portion of the distillation column overhead fluid ratio in order to produce a desired flow ratio in each portion, as similarly produced by the control unit (28a).

In regard to claim 9, and as applied to claims 1 and 2 above, Yao fails to explicitly disclose wherein ethane recovery in the bottom product increases when the first portion of the feed gas vapor increases relative to the second portion of feed gas vapor.

The modification of Yao in view of the teachings of Jain, as discussed above, teaches a plant operated in an ethane recovery mode and an ethane rejection mode (column 84 as demethanizer and deethanizer, col. 6, lns. 2-12). In the mode illustrated in FIG. 3, column 84 is operated as a deethanizer and vapor streams 26 (first portion), 24 (second portion) are split in a 16 to 84 ratio (col. 12, ln. 66 to col. 13, ln. 1). In the mode illustrated in FIG. 2, the ratio of vapor stream 26 to vapor stream 24 is increased

(24 to 76, see col. 10, Ins. 32-35) as distillation column 84 is operated as a demethanizer to produce ethane as the bottom liquid product 110 (col. 12, Ins. 20-22). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Yao with the 2 mode recovery scheme of Jain, and thus the increase a first vapor stream to obtain an ethane bottom product, in order to increase the NGL recovery capabilities of the plant in Yao.

In regard to claim 10, and as applied to claims 1 and 2 above, Yao fails to explicitly disclose wherein ethane recovery in the bottom product increases when the first portion of the distillation column overhead decreases relative to the second portion of the distillation column overhead.

The general concept of controlling a ratio of a first and second portion feed to a column as a function of a desired recovery rate of a feed gas component in a bottom product of the distillation column falls within the realm of common knowledge as obvious mechanical expedient and is illustrated by Jain. Jain teaches adjusting the first and second portion of the feed gas vapor (26, 24) in FIGS. 2 and 3 to obtain a desired recovery rate. FIG. 2 illustrates a process scheme for high ethane recovery with stream 26 forming 24% (stream 24 forming 76%) of the flow (col. 10, Ins. 31-35), while FIG. 3 shows a scheme for high propane recovery with ethane rejection with stream 26 forming 16% (stream 24 forming 84%) of the flow (col. 12 ln. 67 to col. 13 ln. 1). Thus, the ratio of the flows are adjusted differently for the type of process scheme and each process scheme has a desired recovery rate of a feed gas component in a bottom product of the distillation column (col. 6 Ins. 1-4 and col. 12 Ins. 45-50). One of ordinary skill in the art

would have been motivated to provide adjusting the flow ratios of first and second portions of distillation column overhead in order to produce a desired product.

4. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yao et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,116,050) in view of Jain et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,453,698) and Campbell et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,771,712), and further in view of Becker et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,695,349).

In regard to claim 6, and as applied to claim 1 above, Yao and Campbell fail to explicitly disclose wherein the second portion of the distillation column overhead is fed to the bottom of the absorber to thereby form a stripping gas stream.

The general concept of feeding a vapor to the bottom of an absorber to form a stripping gas stream falls within the realm of common knowledge as obvious mechanical expedient and is illustrated in Becker, which teach the well known concept that introducing a stripping gas or vapor to the lower portion of a column is often utilized for the careful separation of materials or substances by distillation (col. 1, Ins. 16-25). One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include the use of a vapor stream from a distillation column overhead in order to further facilitate separation of materials or substances by further lowering the temperature of the gases in the absorber column.

5. Claims 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yao et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,116,050) in view of Jain et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,453,698).

In regard to claim 11, FIG. 2 of Yao discloses providing an absorber (a demethanizer 20 for separation) and a distillation column (73), wherein the absorber receives a plurality of absorber feed streams (25, 15) and provides a bottom product (55) to the distillation column (via 76);

splitting at least one of the feed streams (25) into a first and second portion (26, 30), and introducing the first and second portions at different locations on the absorber (29 and 33, respectively).

Yao fails to explicitly disclose using a flow ratio between the first and second portions to control recovery of a desired product in a bottom product of the distillation column.

The general concept of using a flow ratio between first and second portions of feed streams falls within the realm of common knowledge as obvious mechanical expedient and is illustrated by Jain. Jain teaches that adjusting the first and second portion of the feed gas vapor (26, 24) in FIGS. 2 and 3 to obtain a desired recovery rate. FIG. 2 illustrates a process scheme for high ethane recovery with stream 26 forming 24% (stream 24 forming 76%) of the flow (col. 10, Ins. 31-35), while FIG. 3 shows a scheme for high propane recovery with ethane rejection with stream 26 forming 16% (stream 24 forming 84%) of the flow (col. 12 In. 67 to col. 13 In. 1). Thus, the ratio of the flows are adjusted differently for the type of process scheme and each process scheme has a desired recovery rate of a feed gas component in a bottom product of the distillation column (col. 6 Ins. 1-4 and col. 12 Ins. 45-50). One of ordinary skill in the art

would have been motivated to provide using a flow ratio between the first and second portions of feed gas in order to produce a desired product.

In regard to claim 12, and as applied to claim 11, Yao discloses a step of splitting another one of the feed streams into a first (19) and second (66) portion, and introducing the first and second portions at different locations to the absorber.

Yao fails to explicitly disclose using a flow ratio between the first and second portions of the feed streams, respectively, to control recovery of the desired product in the bottom product of the distillation column.

The general concept of using a flow ratio between first and second portions of two feed streams, respectively, falls within the realm of common knowledge as obvious mechanical expedient and is illustrated by Jain. Jain teaches that adjusting the first and second portion of the feed gas vapor (26, 24) in FIGS. 2 and 3 to obtain a desired recovery rate. FIG. 2 illustrates a process scheme for high ethane recovery with stream 26 forming 24% (stream 24 forming 76%) of the flow (col. 10, Ins. 31-35), while FIG. 3 shows a scheme for high propane recovery with ethane rejection with stream 26 forming 16% (stream 24 forming 84%) of the flow (col. 12 In. 67 to col. 13 In. 1). Thus, the ratio of the flows are adjusted differently for the type of process scheme and each process scheme has a desired recovery rate of a feed gas component in a bottom product of the distillation column (col. 6 Ins. 1-4 and col. 12 Ins. 45-50). Adjusting the flow ratios of a second feed stream would be mere duplication of a known step. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to provide using a flow ratio between the first and second portions of the feeds streams in order to produce a desired product.

In regard to claim 13, and as applied to claim 11, FIG. 2 of Yao discloses wherein the plurality of feed streams comprises a natural gas liquids vapor (col. 7, Ins. 57-59 and col. 8, Ins. 12-15) and natural gas liquids liquid (col. 7, Ins. 57-59 and col. 8, Ins. 2-5).

In regard to claim 14, and as applied to claims 11 and 13, Yao discloses wherein the natural gas liquids vapor and natural gas liquids liquid are provided by a high pressure separator (14).

In regard to claim 15, and as applied to claims 11 and 13, Yao fails to explicitly disclose wherein the desired product in the bottom product of the distillation column is ethane.

The general concept of having ethane as the desired bottom product of a distillation column falls within the realm of common knowledge as obvious mechanical expedient and is illustrated by Jain, which teaches a flexible reflux process for NGL recovery in FIGS. 2 and 3. The distillation column 84 can be operated in an ethane recovery mode and an ethane rejection mode (demethanizer and deethanizer, col. 6, Ins. 2-12). In the mode illustrated in FIG. 2, distillation column 84 is operated as a demethanizer to produce ethane as the bottom liquid product 110 (col. 12, Ins. 20-22). One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include the use of a distillation column operable in an ethane recovery mode in order to recover a useful NGL if desired.

In regard to claim 16, and as applied to claim 11, Yao fails to explicitly disclose wherein the absorber is operated at a pressure that is higher than a pressure in the distillation column.

The general concept of changing the pressure of components in an NGL process to obtain a desired operation falls within the realm of common knowledge as obvious mechanical expedient and is illustrated by Jain, which teaches the concept of operating an absorber at a higher pressure (col. 8, Ins. 8-9) than a pressure in a distillation column (col. 9, In. 24). One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to vary absorber and distillation column pressures in order to obtain the desired plant operation and product.

In regard to claim 17, FIG. 2 of Yao discloses providing an absorber (a demethanizer 20 for separation) that is fluidly coupled to a distillation column (73), wherein the absorber receives a feed gas vapor (29), a feed gas liquid (19), and an overhead product (77) from the distillation column; and

Yao fails to explicitly disclose feeding at least two of (a) a portion of the feed gas vapor, (b) a portion of the feed gas liquid, and (c) a portion of the overhead product to the absorber in a manner effective to control absorber overhead temperature such that ethane content in a bottom product of the distillation column increases when the absorber overhead temperature decreases.

Jain discloses controlling absorber overhead temperature by varying a ratio of a first and second portion of feed gas vapor in a 2 mode operating scheme (see also col. 6, Ins. 2-4). The specific ratios of streams 24, 26 in each of the modes illustrated in FIGS. 2 and 3 determine absorber overhead temperature (col. 11, Ins. 35-39, "stream 40 is obtained at -143°F" and col. 13, Ins. 40-45, "stream 40 is obtained at -88°F"). In an ethane recovery mode of Jain, illustrated in FIG. 2, ethane bottom product increases

(as opposed to the mode in FIG. 3) when the absorber overhead temperature decreases from -88°F to -143°F.

The general concept of controlling ratios of feed gas to operate in a process scheme to obtain a desired product (such as ethane) falls within the realm of common knowledge as obvious mechanical expedient and is illustrated in Jain, as described above. The modification of Yao in light of Jain teaches an ethane bottom product increasing as absorber overhead temperature decreases, as a result of operation of the modification. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include the use of a 2 process scheme such as that disclosed in Jain in order to produce a desired product.

In regard to claim 18, and as applied to claim 17, Yao fails to explicitly disclose wherein the absorber is operated at a pressure that is higher than a pressure in the distillation column.

The general concept of changing the pressure of components in an NGL process to obtain a desired operation falls within the realm of common knowledge as obvious mechanical expedient and is illustrated by Jain, which teaches the concept of operating an absorber at an absorber pressure (col. 8, Ins. 8-9) and a distillation column at a distillation column pressure (col. 9, In. 24), where the absorber pressure (350 Psia) is greater than the distillation column pressure (330 Psia). These pressures are used for a high propane recovery with ethane rejection plant operation. During the ethane recovery mode, the pressure in the distillation column is increased to 383 Psia (col. 11, In. 47) to obtain the desired product. One having ordinary skill in the art would have

been motivated to operate the absorber at a higher pressure than the distillation column pressure in order to obtain the refrigeration required for a desired product as illustrated in Jain's high propane and ethane rejection operation.

In regard to claim 19, and as applied to claim 17, Yao discloses wherein the portion of the feed gas vapor (29) and the portion of the overhead product (45) are used as absorber reflux (col. 8 lns. 12-26 and col. 10, lns. 29-31).

In regard to claim 20, and as applied to claim 17, Yao discloses wherein the portion of the feed gas vapor (29), the portion of the feed gas liquid (19), and the portion of the overhead product are fed to the absorber (see FIG. 2).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LUKAS BALDRIDGE whose telephone number is 571-270-3782. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9 to 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisors can be reached at 571-272-6681 (Frantz Jules) or 571-2724834 (Cheryl Tyler). The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Frantz F. Jules/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3744